

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/260,037

Applicant(s)
Yacoby-Zeevi

Examiner
Richard Hutson

Group Art Unit
1652



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard Hutson

(3) _____

(2) MOYNIHAN, MARTIN D

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 19, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all claims of record

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Informed applicants representative that recent after final amendment would not be entered because the recitation of "ex vivo" raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Further applicants amendment if entered and applicants argument would not overcome current 103 rejection based on Fuks et al. and Wang et al. references. Examiner indicated that a advisory would be forthcoming.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/260,037

Applicant(s)
Yacoby-Zeevi

Examiner
Richard Hutson

Group Art Unit
1652



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard Hutson

(3) _____

(2) Bel Erlich

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 20, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☒ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed New claims 54-59

Identification of prior art discussed:

Fuks et al. and Wang et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed with applicants why there argument traversing 103 rej (Fuks et al. and Wang et al.) was not persuasive, because tissues comprise cells (See also attached sheet). Applicants suggested that the claims drawn to biological prep. comprising tissues would be canceled and the claims amended to being drawn to biological prep. comprising "cells not in a tissue", or "cells in suspension". While such an amendment would overcome the art of record, such an amendment after final would not be proper because this new limitation, "cells not in a tissue", or "cells in suspension" would require further search and/or examination. Applicant was advised to submit such an amendment in the form of a CPA. Applicant disagreed that such an amendment after-final would be improper and expressed his desire to have such an amendment entered on the basis that such a limitation, should have already been searched in searching for "A biological prep. comprising cells or tissues" because he interprets this claim as a biological prep. comprising cells not in tissue or cells in tissue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.